DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 250 SO 010 637

AUTHOR Switzer, Thomas J.; And Others
TITLE Perceptions of Undergraduate Social Studies Methods Instructors on the Nature of the Social Studies, Knowledge and Utilization of National Curriculum Project Materials, National versus Local Curriculum Development, and Impact of the National Project Movement [And] Tables.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 65p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Cincinnati, Ohio, November 23-26, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Curriculum Development; Data Analysis; Educational Background; Educational Objectives; Educational Practice; Educational Research; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Higher Education; Information Utilization; Intellectual Disciplines; Knowledge Level; Methods Courses; *Methods Teachers; Projects; *Social Studies; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teacher Orientation; Undergraduate Students; *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted concerning teacher attitudes and knowledge regarding social studies goals, content, and curriculum development. The research involved 301 undergraduate social studies methods professors in 13 western and midwestern states. Indexes based upon responses to a questionnaire were created to reflect teacher orientation toward innovation in four areas: (1) goals for social studies in elementary and secondary education; (2) knowledge and utilization of national project materials; (3) preference for locally developed or nationally developed curriculum materials; and (4) attitudes toward the national curriculum project movement and federal involvement in curriculum development. Major findings indicated that elementary and secondary methods professors are overwhelmingly modern (innovative, interdisciplinary, and affectively oriented) in their attitudes toward social studies. Other findings indicated that instructors favor federal support, prefer locally developed curriculum materials, generally tell their students about new curriculum materials, and know more about new curriculum materials if they participate actively in social studies professional activities and associations. Recommendations were that curriculum development and dissemination of materials be federally funded, curriculum materials be systematically introduced to methods instructors and students, methods teachers participate actively in the social studies profession, and research be conducted to determine how information regarding curriculum materials can be diffused more rapidly. More than 125 tables accompany the report. (Author/DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED151250

PERCEPTIONS OF UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL STUDIES METHODS INSTRUCTORS ON THE NATURE OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES, KNOWLEDGE AND UTILIZATION OF NATIONAL CURRICULUM PROJECT MATERIALS, NATIONAL VERSUS LOCAL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL PROJECT MOVEMENT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas J. Switzer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Thomas J. Switzer
The University of Michigan

Ed Walker
Boise State University

Gale Mitchell
The University of Michigan

SP010637

Research Roundtable Report Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the College and University Faculty Assembly of The National Council for the Social Studies, Cincinnati, Ohio -- November, 1977.

PERCEPTIONS OF UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL STUDIES METHODS INSTRUCTORS ON THE NATURE OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES, KNOWLEDGE AND UTILIZATION OF NATIONAL CURRICULUM PROJECT MATERIALS, NATIONAL VERSUS LOCAL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL PROJECT MOVEMENT

by

Thomas J. Switzer, Ed Walker, and Gale Mitchell*

For many years the social studies has suffered an identity crisis. Struggling without clear definition of the parameters of the field, influenced by changing societal conditions, and recently impacted by the national curriculum project movement, professionals in the field have been both perplexed and frequently embarrassed when asked for a clear statement of appropriate goals for social studies instruction. In spite of frequent efforts to define the field, confusion still exists as to desirable directions for the social studies.[1]

This uncertainty is not, however, restricted to questions of appropriate content and curriculum organization. For example, the proper role of the federal government in curriculum development and implementation and dissemination activities is still an open question. What aspects of curriculum development can best be dealt with at the national level and which best dealt with at the local level? What has been the impact of recent federal efforts in curriculum development? To what

---

*Thomas J. Switzer is Associate Professor of Education at The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Ed Walker is Assistant Professor of Education at Boise State University, Boise, Idaho. Gale Mitchell is a doctoral candidate in social studies education at The University of Michigan.

extent are the materials resulting from federally funded curriculum projects a part of undergraduate social studies instruction and to what extent have they influenced social studies instruction in elementary and secondary schools? These are the main questions which gave direction to the research study reported on here.

Unfortunately, much of the debate to date over the appropriateness of federal funding of curriculum development, dissemination, and implementation activities has been of a highly charged emotional nature. Advocates on both sides have argued largely out of conviction, with little empirical support for their positions. In fact, only a few studies have been conducted on the utilization of new social studies project materials in different geographic areas around the country.[2]

Procedure

In the winter of 1976-77, deans of all schools and colleges of education in five midwestern and eight western states were asked to provide names of their undergraduate social studies methods professors. Four hundred and sixty-five methods instructors were identified in the Midwest and 164 were identified in the West. A total of 629 questionnaires were mailed to these instructors early in 1977. Two hundred sixty-three responses were returned from the Midwest (56.6 percent) and 101 responses received from instructors in the West (61.6 percent), for a total response rate of 57.9 percent. Of the

364 questionnaires returned, 301 (84 from the West and 217 from the Midwest) were usable for analysis. The remaining 63 instructors returning questionnaires were incorrectly identified by their deans as teaching social studies methods.

Descriptive Information On Respondents

Table 1 summarizes data on the respondents by state and type of methods course taught.* As can be seen, the majority of the total respondents (64.1 percent) taught general social studies methods, whereas 12.7 percent taught general teaching methods, and only 5.8 percent taught methods of a specific discipline. Seventy-two and one-tenth percent of the respondents came from the Midwest. In several of the western states, so few undergraduate social studies methods professors were identified by their deans, that responses from these states are very limited in number.

The following descriptive information about the 301 respondents used for analysis is interesting in its own right and may assist the reader in interpreting the data presented later.

1. Of the 301 usable responses to the questionnaire, 77 7 percent (234) taught a general social studies methods course, 7 percent (21) taught a methods course in a specific discipline, and 15.3 percent (46) taught a general teaching methods course including some social studies content.

---

*The report presented here consists of this paper and a set of tables found separately.

2. Of the 301 usable responses, 71.4 percent were from the five midwestern states with 28 percent from the eight western states. Two respondents (0.7 percent) could not be identified by state.

3. Age range from 26 to 70.

4. 49.8 percent held the Ph.D. degree (150), 27.2 percent the Ed.D. degree (82), 1.3 percent the Ed.S. degree (4), 18.6 percent the M.A. degree (56), and 0.7 percent the B.A. degree (2). Seven respondents did not identify their degree.

5. 38.5 percent (116) received their highest degree within the last 6 years, and 21.9 percent (66) received their highest degree more than 15 years ago. 80.4 percent (242) received their highest degree in education.

6. 27.9 percent (84) were assistant professors, 35.9 percent (108) were associate professors, 24.9 percent (75) were full professors, and 7.7 percent (23) were teaching assistants or instructors. 2.3 percent (7) listed some other academic rank.

7. 57.5 percent (173) were members of The National Council for the Social Studies.

8. 42.2 percent (127) came from institutions with enrollment of 3,000 or less. 20.6 percent (62) came from an institution with enrollment over 15,000.

9. 39.2 percent (118) taught secondary methods, 44.5 percent (134) taught elementary methods, 4.3 percent (13) taught a mixed elementary and secondary class, and 10.6 percent (32) taught separate courses at the secondary and elementary levels.

10. 33.0 percent (99) taught twenty or fewer students per academic year.

11. 66.8 percent (201) had taught in one or two institutions.

12. 55.8 percent (168) were from publicly supported institutions.

PART I

GOALS FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

The first major section of the study dealt with what social studies methods instructors considered to be appropriate goals for social studies in elementary and secondary schools. Based on a review of the literature dealing with goal statements for the social studies, on an examination of materials developed by national curriculum projects, and on the researchers' own personal experiences, twenty-four goal statements in social studies were developed. Fifteen of these statements were worded so that acceptance of the statements indicated agreement with what might be termed a modern view of the social studies. Nine statements were worded to reflect a more traditional view of the social studies. Traditionally worded goal statements are indicated on Table I-A. The statements were assessed on a five-point scale: (1) complete agreement, (2) considerable agreement, (3) unsure, (4) considerable disagreement, and (5) complete disagreement.

Table I-A reports the mean score for each goal statement by region of the country, level of methods course taught, and total respondents. The statements are ranked from most accepted to least accepted using the mean score for the total respondents. With only one exception, all of the statements worded to reflect a traditional orientation ranked below those worded to reflect a more modern orientation. Only the statement, "Social studies courses should focus primarily on current

topics of personal interest to students," a statement considered to be modern, ranked below the lowest scoring traditionally worded statement. Thirteen of the statements had a mean score below 2.5 and might be thought of as constituting an accepted category. Five statements had mean scores between 2.5 and 3.5, which might be considered the unsure category. Six statements fell above a mean of 3.5 and might be placed in the disagreement category. It is interesting to note that the accepted category characterizes the social stuides as interdisciplinary in nature, affectively oriented, inquiry-based, global in perspective, and committed to student action. In the unsure category we see some statements which have been the subject of much debate. Methods professors are still unsure concerning the importance of focusing on immediate student needs and topics of current interest, of developing patriotic values, of using a standard textbook, and of basing grades on tests of basic knowledge. In the disagreement category we see a rejection of certain goals for the social studies which at one time were probably highly favored, e.g., the importance of the academic disciplines and the value of direct communication of information.

Comparison of mean scores for elementary and secondary methods instructors also provides some interesting information. Data presented in Table I-B show that on one-half of the 24 goals statements, elementary and secondary instructors were significantly different in the degree to which they accepted the statement. It is not, of course, that the elementary and

secondary professors disagree drastically on the relative ranking of the goals statements, for as we have seen in the previous table, such is not the case. They do, however, show significant disagreement on specific items. Elementary professors are significantly more likely to accept the first seven statements in Table I-B and significantly more likely to reject the last five. Six of the first seven statements reflect a more modern orientation toward the social studies, while the last five reflect a more traditional orientation. With the exception of their view on teaching patriotic values, elementary professors appear to be consistently more modern in orientation than do secondary professors.

To facilitate analysis on this part of the questionnaire, an index was created based on individual responses to the twenty-four goals statements. The nine statements worded to reflect traditional views of social studies were reversed in direction and a mean score assigned to each respondent, reflecting that person's overall view of the social studies. Low scores reflected a modern orientation with high scores reflecting a more traditional orientation. Examination of the mean scores revealed, however, that very few of the respondents fell into what could be called a truly traditional category. Therefore, a decision was made to place the respondents roughly into three equal categories. Those respondents with a mean score of 1.9 or less were placed in the most modern category, those over 1.9 and less than 2.2 were placed

in a less modern category, and those over 2.2 in the least modern category. Since a mean score of 2.0 would reflect considerable agreement with the goals statements, it can be seen that the least modern category contains within it professors who would be considered individually as quite modern in orientation. They are, however, categorically less modern than those in the other two categories.

Data presented in Table I-C show the modern, less modern, and least modern breakdown by state. In the Midwest, Ohio led the way with 51 percent of the respondents in the modern category while Wisconsin took the back seat with only 21.6 percent modern. Unfortunately, responses from individual western states were so few in number that the data for that region had little meaning.

Analysis of the background variables of the respondents in relation to the modern, less modern, and least modern categories revealed nine significant relationships. These data are reported in Tables I-D through I-L.

In Table I-D, we see that elementary methods instructors are significantly more likely than secondary methods instructors ($p < .01$) to be more modern in orientation. That is, of course, consistent with the data presented in Table I-B.

Table I-E shows us that those teaching social studies methods and those teaching general methods are more likely to be modern in orientation than those respondents teaching methods in a specific discipline. Seventy-four percent of those teaching general methods fall into the first two modern

categories as do 69.7 percent of those teaching social studies methods. In contrast, 71.4 percent of those teaching methods in a specific discipline are in the least modern category.

When we consider academic area in which the respondents received their highest degree, Table I-F, we see that those from schools and colleges of education are far more modern than those whose highest degree is in one of the academic disciplines. This finding is consistent with that in the previous table.

Table I-G presents data on source of institutional support and reveals that respondents teaching in publicly financed institutions were significantly more modern in orientation than were respondents in privately funded institutions. Forty-two and nine-tenths percent of those from publicly financed institutions were modern in orientation, while only 26.7 percent of those from privately funded institutions were in the modern category.

When number of methods sections taught each year was considered, Table I-H, it was found that respondents teaching only one section were least modern in orientation. Those teaching two or three sections were similar in orientation and show the highest percentage of respondents in the most modern category. Those teaching four or more sections, however, had the highest combined percentage in the first two categories, 80.7 percent.

An analysis of the modern, less modern, and least modern categories by number of students taught each academic year,

Table I-I, produced results similar to those for number of sections taught. Respondents teaching 20 or fewer students were least modern while those teaching 41 to 80 students had the highest percentage in the modern category. Those teaching the greatest number of students had the highest percentage in the middle category.

Table I-J presents some interesting data showing that methods professors who think that the national curriculum project movement should have had more impact on secondary social studies than it has (less than warranted) are most modern (40.4 percent in the modern category), while those who think the project impact to be more than that warranted are least modern (71.4 percent).

Supporters of The National Council for the Social Studies will be pleased by the data in Table I-K, which shows that methods instructors who belong to N.C.S.S. are significantly more modern than those who do not belong to this professional organization. Forty-one and six-tenths percent of the N.C.S.S. members fall into the modern category, whereas only 27.0 percent of the non-N.C.S.S. members are in this category.

Finally, support for federal involvement in implementation and dissemination activities was found to be positively related to being modern in orientation, Table I-L. Only 28.9 percent of those who agreed with this position were in the least modern category, whereas 51.6 percent of those who were unsure and 55.0 percent of those who were in disagreement with

federal involvement in these areas were in the least modern category.

Two additional variables, belief in increasing federal support for implementation and dissemination activities, and impact of the national project movement on undergraduate methods instruction, almost resulted in significant differences when related to the modern, less modern, and least modern categories. Data in Table I-M show that respondents who agreed with increased federal support for implementation and dissemination activities were somewhat more likely to be modern in orientation, but the probability level reached only .06. In Table I-N, we see that those methods professors who felt that the national project movement has had great impact on their undergraduate teaching were most modern in orientation. Although the data is quite consistent throughout the categories, the probability level was slightly over .05.

Another set of variables investigated in the study dealt with the degree to which undergraduate social studies methods instructors had been involved directly with the national curriculum projects or with efforts associated with materials produced by these projects. When these variables were examined in relation to the modern, less modern, and least modern orientations, Table I-O, no significant relationships resulted. Only "writer for a national project" approached significance, $p < .09$. The data are, however, interesting in their own right. For example, 95.6 percent of the respondents (284) had not been funded to develop curricular materials, 92.2

percent (272) had not been funded to conduct dissemination activities, 90.9 percent (271) had not been a staff member of a national curriculum project, 88.9 percent (264) had never served as a writer for a project, 84.7 percent (250) had not published a document relating to the national curriculum project, 81.5 percent (242) had not served as a consultant to a national project, 71.1 percent (212) had not conducted training programs on the national curriculum projects, and 47.7 percent (142) had never received special training concerning the materials produced by the national curriculum projects.

Tables I-P through I-Z present data for several additional variables found not to be significantly related to a modern, less modern, or least modern orientation towards the social studies. No significant differences were found for region of the country (Table I-P), highest degree held (Table I-Q), age (Table I-R), academic rank (Table I-S), recency of preparation (Table I-T), number of professional organizations belonged to (Table I-U), attendance at N.C.S.S. meetings (Table I-V), attendance at state social studies meetings (Table I-W), on-campus enrollment (Table I-X), years teaching experience (Table I-Y), and number of institutions taught in (Table I-Z).

Several of these tables, however, deserve special mention. Table I-R shows that instructors in the 26-35 years of age category were somewhat more modern than were those in the older age category. Table I-V reveals that respondents who attend N.C.S.S. meetings were somewhat more modern than

were those who do not attend such meetings with the direction being that the more meetings attended, the more modern the orientation. It is also worth noting that 45.6 percent (134) of the methods instructors had attended no regional or national N.C.S.S. meetings in the last six years, while another 18.8 percent (55) had attended only one such meeting in the last six years. State meetings fare only slightly better (Table I-W) where only 40.8 percent (120) of the respondents had attended no meetings during the last six years. And, although not producing a significant relationship, data in Table I-X reveal that instructors in small schools (under 3,000 enrollment) were considerably less modern than their colleagues in larger institutions.

Discussion

Several of the findings from this part of the study deserve comment. Although it might be expected that university and college methods professors would reflect a modern orientation toward their field, the extent to which the respondents in this study were modern in orientation was somewhat surprising. Very few of the respondents expressed a traditional view of the social studies, so few in fact that a truly traditional category of methods professors representing a sufficient number of respondents could not be identified. Although disagreement can still be found and uncertainty still persists concerning desirable goals for the social studies, a main finding

from this study is the considerable degree of agreement among undergraduate instructors as to appropriate directions for the social studies.

That elementary methods professors are significantly more modern than are secondary methods professors may be explained by the nature of these two areas. As one examines trends in education in general and in the social studies in particular over the last ten to fifteen years, these trends seem more reflective of the on-going emphasis in elementary education than they do of the emphasis in secondary education. The interdisciplinary, inquiry-based, affectively oriented classroom with the flexibility to focus on immediate student needs has characterized elementary classrooms far more than secondary classrooms. Many, if not most, secondary classrooms continue to focus on the academic disciplines, on academic achievement as contrasted to self-development, and on direct communication of information by teacher or textbook. In short, secondary social studies has been more directly tied to the academic disciplines than has elementary social studies, and secondary methods instructors continue to hold this orientation to a greater extent than do their elementary colleagues.

That conservatism concerning goals for the social studies is linked with a commitment to the academic disciplines is further strengthened by the finding that those respondents teaching methods courses in a specific discipline and those receiving their highest degree in one of the academic disciplines were significantly less modern than those teaching

social studies methods or general methods and those whose highest degree was in education respectively.

The findings that instructors in publicly financed institutions were more modern than those in privately financed institutions, that instructors who teach more than one methods section per year are more modern than those teaching just one section, and that those teaching between 21 and 80 students per year are somewhat more modern than either those teaching fewer than 21 or more than 80, may be interrelated. Instructors in privately financed institutions may teach fewer sections of social studies methods and may have fewer students than do their counterparts in public institutions. Consequently, they may not be devoting full time to the social studies and might, therefore, be less aware of new trends in the field. Of course, it might also be that the goals of teacher training programs in privately funded institutions differ from those in publicly funded institutions.

Given the fact that the nature of the social studies as portrayed in much of the material developed by the national curriculum projects is consistent with a modern orientation as defined for this study, it is hardly surprising that those respondents supporting federal involvement in implementation and dissemination activities and those feeling that the project materials have not had the impact which they deserve were also modern in orientation. One might also anticipate that belonging to The National Council for the Social Studies and being exposed to the publications of this organization would

also result, as it did, in a modern conception of the social studies.

That so few members of the social studies profession have been involved in the national curriculum projects is particularly disturbing. Given the fact that much of the funding for the national projects went to academic professional societies and that the relatively limited number of these projects would prohibit large numbers of individuals from participating directly, one might expect few social studies educators to have direct involvement as developers and writers. The fact remains, however, that few social studies educators had any direct hand in conceptualizing and creating the national project movement. This is, of course, neither good nor bad in and of itself, and there are exceptions where a few outstanding members of the social studies profession made important contributions to the project movement. What is most disturbing is that few members of the social studies profession have been conducting courses or workshops on the national project materials, that so few have been engaged in dissemination and implementation activities, and that so few have published articles or conducted research on the national projects. Further, just over half of the respondents in this study had ever participated in a course, workshop, or institute on the national projects. As shall be seen later in this paper, this is in spite of the fact that methods professors tend to rate the quality of the projects quite high.

Several of the tables presented earlier dealt with the

general categories of age versus youth, experience versus inexperience, and cosmopolitanism versus provincialism as related to orientation toward goals for the social studies. Suffice it to say that one might have hypothesized that youth, inexperience, and cosmopolitanism would be significantly related to a modern view of the social studies. Such was not the case.

PART II

KNOWLEDGE AND UTILIZATION OF NATIONAL PROJECT MATERIALS

The second major section of the study dealt with social studies methods instructors' knowledge and use of national project materials. Twenty secondary and six elementary projects were identified. Eight statements dealing with knowledge and use of the materials were developed with statements ranging from "Have you heard of the materials?" to "Do students have an opportunity to teach from these materials during your methods course?" In addition, respondents were asked to assess the quality of each project on a five-point scale: (1) high, (2) good, (3) average, (4) low, and (5) poor.

Table II-A reports on the knowledge and use of the twenty-six projects by level or methods course taught and by the total respondents. Of the twenty secondary projects, only three (the High School Geography Project 71.2 percent, the Harvard Public Issues Series 72.0 percent, and the Amherst History Project 77.1 percent) were heard of by more than 70 percent of the secondary respondents. Conversely, five secondary projects (Economics in Society 28.0 percent, Subject to Citizen 26.3 percent, Exploring Human Nature 27.1 percent, People and Technology 24.6 percent, and Exploring Childhood 11.0 percent) were heard of by fewer than 30 percent of the secondary respondents. While extremely low familiarity with some of these projects might be explained by the relative recency of their development, it is difficult to explain why fewer than

50 percent of the secondary methods instructors had not heard of established programs such as Justice in Urban America (42.4 percent) or Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences (43.2 percent).

At the examined level, fifteen of the twenty secondary projects had been examined by fewer than 50 percent of the secondary respondents, while the Harvard Project was examined the most by 60 percent of the secondary methods instructors. Generally, most secondary methods instructors had not had and/or taken the opportunity to examine project materials. In addition, few secondary methods instructors had received instruction in the use of project materials. Responses ranged from a high of 27.1 percent for instruction about the High School Geography Project to a low of 3.4 percent for Exploring Human Nature. No secondary respondents reported receiving instruction in the use of the Exploring Childhood Project; however, the small number of respondents for each category of this project makes interpretation especially difficult. Generally, one can conclude from this data that instruction in the use of national project materials did not reach methods instructors.

For nineteen of the twenty secondary projects, fewer than 50 percent of the secondary respondents had the project materials available to them. Responses ranged from a high of 50 percent for the Harvard Public Issues Series to a low of 3.4 percent for Exploring Childhood. This data indicates that most secondary methods instructors could not use project materials to any great extent -- even if they preferred them --

because they do not have them available.

For seventeen of the twenty secondary projects, fewer than 50 percent of the secondary instructors told their undergraduate students about the project materials. The High School Geography Project (58.5 percent), the Amherst History Project (51.4 percent), and the Harvard Public Issues Series (57.6 percent) were the only projects where at least 50 percent of the respondents reported telling their students about the materials. Even fewer of the students actually see the material in published form. For no secondary project did 50 percent of the secondary respondents report showing the published materials. This might be explained in part by the fact that the materials were generally not available to show to students.

Finally, few undergraduate social studies students saw project materials demonstrated or had a chance to teach from the materials. At the high end of the scale, only 39.8 percent of the instructors said their students saw the Harvard Public Issues Series demonstrated. Thirty-three and one tenth percent of the instructors said their students had the opportunity to teach using materials from the High School Geography Project with the same percentage reporting that students teach from the Harvard Public Issues Series.

The pattern established by the secondary respondents also holds for the six elementary projects with the exception that two elementary projects (Man: A Course of Study and the Taba Curriculum Development Project) generally had higher response rates for all categories. These two projects had been heard of

by more than 80 percent of the elementary respondents, had been examined by more than 65 percent of the elementary respondents, and were available to more than 50 percent of the instructors. More than 60 percent of the elementary instructors told their undergraduate students about these two projects, more than 40 percent used them for classroom demonstration, and nearly 30 percent said students were able to teach from these materials.

The pattern continues as one examines the knowledge and use data of the total respondents. Man: A Course of Study was consistently highest in all categories with Exploring Childhood consistently lowest. The remaining projects repeated the pattern which developed when elementary and secondary instructors were examined separately.

It is interesting to note that for all projects, the percent of instructors who told their students about the materials is very close to the percent who examined those materials, suggesting that professors who have first-hand knowledge of the materials tell their students about them. A similar conclusion results from a comparison of the percent stating that they have materials available to them and the percent stating that students see the published materials. Once again the data indicate that most of the instructors who had the materials available showed them to their students. Few students see the project materials demonstrated or actually get to teach from the materials. Perhaps this is related to the paucity of

professors who had been instructed in the use of the materials, which is the category which consistently had the lowest percentages.

Table II-B presents data on the perceived quality of the project materials. The projects are ranked on the basis of mean scores from highest to lowest in perceived quality. Elementary and secondary projects are treated separately. The data reveal that those instructors who rated the projects generally saw them of good quality. For example, the High School Geography Project and the Taba Curriculum Development Project were rated good or better by 92.6 percent and 82.2 percent respectively. And in all cases, more than 60 percent of the respondents assessing the projects rated the materials good or better. No elementary or secondary project had a mean score lower than 2.2, which would place the project in the good category.

To facilitate analysis on this part of the questionnaire, separate indices were created for secondary methods instructors and for elementary methods instructors. Scoring for each respondent was based on the total number of times that a person gave a positive response to a question regarding knowledge and use of project materials. A total score was developed for each secondary methods instructor based on responses to questions concerning the twenty secondary projects included in the study. The index for elementary methods instructors was based on responses to questions concerning the six elementary projects. For each index, three categories were developed reflecting high, medium, and low knowledge and use of project

materials. Approximately one-third of the respondents were placed in each category. The remaining data in Part II are based on these indices.

Data presented in Tables II-C and II-D show the low, medium, and high knowledge and use categorization of secondary and elementary instructors by state. In the Midwest, Michigan led the way with 42.1 percent of the secondary instructors and 41.2 percent of the elementary instructors in the high knowledge and use category. Unfortunately, responses from individual western states were so few in number that the data for these states have little meaning.

Table II-F shows that elementary methods instructors in the western region were significantly more likely to know about and use elementary project materials than elementary professors in the midwest. This pattern, however, was not repeated for secondary instructors in the two regions (Table II-E).

Tables II-G through II-R present data on the relationship between background variables of the respondents and knowledge and use of project materials. Table II-G shows that secondary social studies methods instructors were significantly more likely to know about and use project materials than were instructors involved in general teaching methods or teaching methods for specific disciplines. Table II-H shows a trend in a similar direction for elementary instructors although a significant relationship was not found. Small cell size, unfortunately, tends to make the statistics unreliable.

One might expect to find a significant relationship

between the level of project knowledge and use and academic area of highest degree; however, Tables II-I and II-J reveal no significant relationship for either secondary or elementary instructors. For secondary instructors, the pattern is for education majors to have higher knowledge and use of project materials, and for academic discipline majors to show lower knowledge and use. However, this pattern is not clear for elementary instructors since only three of them received their highest degree in an academic discipline and the cell size is too small for accurate analysis.

Tables II-K and II-L present data on knowledge and use by highest degree held. Again no significant differences were found for secondary or elementary instructors who held a Ph.D., an Ed.D., or a degree less than a doctorate.

When we consider recency of academic preparation, Tables II-M and II-N, we see that years since receiving highest degree was significantly related to knowledge and use for secondary instructors, but not for elementary instructors. More importantly, the data show that instructors who received their highest degree 5-8 years ago are the most likely to know about and use the national projects. Fifty-one and seven-tenths percent of the secondary instructors and 37.1 percent of the elementary instructors with 5-8 years of experience are in the high knowledge and use category. It is also interesting to note that 42.9 percent of the secondary instructors and 44.1 percent of the elementary instructors who received their highest degrees within the last four years fall into the low knowledge and use

category. It appears that learning about the national projects has not been emphasized recently in advanced degree programs.

Tables II-O and II-P show that age was significantly related to knowledge and use for secondary instructors but not for elementary instructors. Forty-six and four-tenths percent of the secondary and 42.1 percent of the elementary instructors in the 36-40 age range were in the high knowledge and use category. It may be, therefore, that age and recency of academic preparation are measuring the same variable and indicate that mid-career professionals are more likely to know about and use the project materials. Information about academic rank in Tables II-Q and II-R mildly supports this conclusion, although the results were not statistically significant. It is noteworthy, however, that 51.7 percent of the secondary assistant professors -- instructors who probably received their degree recently -- were low in knowledge and use of the project materials.

Tables II-S through II-Z consider the importance of membership in professional organizations and attendance at social studies meetings. Membership in The National Council for the Social Studies (Tables II-S and II-T) was significantly related to knowledge and use of project materials for both secondary and elementary instructors. Forty-six and seven-tenths percent of the secondary instructors and 49.3 percent of the elementary instructors who belong to The National Council for the Social Studies were in the high knowledge and use category. In addition, attendance at national, regional, and state social

studies meetings was found to be significantly related to knowledge and use of project materials. More than 70 percent of the secondary and elementary instructors who attended six or more national and regional N.C.S.S. meetings (Tables II-U and II-V) during the last six years were in the high knowledge and use category. Further, more than 50 percent who attended 2-5 of these meetings within the last six years were in the high knowledge and use category. When attendance at state meetings is considered, we see that more than 50 percent of the secondary and elementary instructors who attended 4 or more state social studies meetings (Tables II-W and II-X) within the last six years were in the high use category.

While membership in social studies organizations was significantly related to knowledge and use of projects, Tables II-Y and II-Z reveal that membership in professional organizations, in general, was not significantly related to knowledge and use of national project materials. Apparently, a key factor in high knowledge and use of project materials is belonging to a social studies organization such as The National Council for the Social Studies.

Tables II-AA through II-HH include several variables related to institutional setting. Tables II-AA and II-BB present data on the source of institutional support and reveal that respondents teaching in publicly financed institutions were significantly higher in knowledge and use of national project materials than were respondents in privately funded institutions.

In Tables II-CC and II-DD, we see that total on-campus enrollment is also significantly related to knowledge and use of project materials. More than 60 percent of the secondary instructors and more than 40 percent of the elementary instructors on campuses with a total enrollment of over 12,000 were high in knowledge and use.

Tables II-EE through II-HH present data showing that the number of methods sections taught and the number of students taught each year are significantly related to knowledge and use of national project materials. Fifty percent of the methods professors who taught four or more sections of social studies methods fall in the high knowledge and use category. Conversely, instructors teaching only one section of methods were comparatively low in knowledge and use (Tables II-EE and II-FF). Similar findings hold for number of students taught each year. Generally speaking, the greater the number of students taught each year, the higher the knowledge and use of project materials. This finding holds for both elementary and secondary respondents (Tables II-GG and II-HH). It may be that those instructors who devote full-time to social studies instruction are more aware of trends in the field than those instructors assigned several teaching responsibilities.

Tables II-II through II-LL consider the relationships of the length and diversity of teaching experience with knowledge and use of project materials. Table II-II shows that for secondary methods instructors, the number of years teaching

undergraduate methods is significantly related to knowledge and use of project materials. More than 40 percent of the instructors with 4-6 and 7-10 years of experience were in the high knowledge and use category. Although this pattern is repeated for elementary instructors, the results are not statistically significant. In contrast, both elementary and secondary instructors with limited experience (1-3 years) have over 50 percent in the low knowledge and use category. Whereas length of teaching experience was significantly related to knowledge and use of project materials, data in Tables II-KK and II-LL show no such relationship for number of post-secondary institutions taught in, although the data do lean toward high knowledge and use being associated with teaching in a number of institutions.

Tables II-MM and II-NN are most interesting. They focus on the degree to which undergraduate social studies methods instructors were involved directly with the national curriculum projects or with efforts associated with materials produced by these projects. When these variables were examined in relation to low, medium, and high levels of knowledge and use, several significant relationships were found. For secondary instructors, involvement as a workshop participant, workshop leader, project consultant, project writer, project staff member, disseminator with a funded proposal, or a writer of a published document about the projects were each positively related to high knowledge and use of project materials. Although the small number of respondents in some of the cells makes the statistics somewhat unreliable, the pattern remains clear and unquestionable. The smaller

number of elementary respondents makes the statistics for elementary instructors even more unreliable; however, a similar pattern is evident.

Tables II-OO and II-PP show that knowledge and use of project materials was significantly related to impact of the project movement on the teaching of both secondary and elementary methods instructors. More than 80 percent of the secondary professors who felt the projects had a great impact on their teaching were in the high knowledge and use category, while more than 60 percent of the elementary instructors who felt the projects had considerable impact on their teaching were in the high knowledge category.

Tables II-QQ and II-RR present data dealing with the relationship between knowledge and use of project materials and methods instructors' perceptions of the impact of the project movement on social studies teaching in secondary and elementary schools. In Table II-QQ we see that secondary methods instructors who feel that the impact of the project movement on secondary schools has been positive aresignificantly higher in knowledge and use than are those who think the project movement has had no impact or limited impact. The same pattern exists for elementary methods instructors' perceptions of the impact of the project movement on social studies instruction in elementary schools, but the differences are not significant (Table II-RR). It is interesting to note that only 12 of 111 secondary methods instructors and 21 of 130 elementary respondents said the

national project movement had no impact or a negative effect on teaching in secondary or elementary schools respectively.

Tables II-SS and II-TT present some interesting data suggesting that methods instructors who think that the national curriculum project movement should have had more impact on social studies teaching than it has (less than warranted) are most often higher in knowledge and use of the project materials. While the statistics are not significant, the pattern is evident.

Finally, support for federal involvement in curriculum development and dissemination activities was found to be positively related to high knowledge and use of project materials (Tables II-UU and II-VV). Over 39 percent of the secondary respondents who felt the federal government should continue support for curriculum development activities were in the high knowledge category. Conversely, more than 60 percent of the secondary respondents who felt federal support should be discontinued for curriculum development were in the low knowledge and use category. Findings for elementary methods instructors did not indicate such a clear-cut polarity, but are in much the same direction as for secondary methods instructors.

Discussion

Several of the findings in this part of the study deserve comment. Except for the most established or controversial national curriculum projects, methods professors had little knowledge about the projects and rarely used project materials in

their teaching, in spite of the fact that project materials were generally rated high in quality. Generally speaking, methods instructors were teaching their courses without having examined the project materials, without having the project materials available to them, and without having received instruction in the use of project materials. Consequently, few undergraduate social studies students (1) were told about the materials, (2) were given the opportunity to see the materials in their published form, (3) saw the materials demonstrated, or (4) had a chance to teach from the materials. One might conclude, then, that undergraduate social studies students generally leave their methods courses uninformed about the national project materials.

The data also suggest that recently-educated graduate students who joined the academic ranks within the last three or four years also had not received information about project materials during their graduate education. A high percentage of assistant professors with one to four years of college-teaching experience were found in the low knowledge and use category. It is especially interesting that the more established mid-career people -- often associate professors with five to eight years of experience -- show a relatively high degree of knowledge and use of the project materials. One might hypothesize that these are the people that become more involved with professional organizations and often attend national, regional, and state meetings and conduct and/or attend workshops as they pursue career advancement. Another explanation might be, however, that these are the people who received their highest degree at the

peak of the project movement and that they did receive more orientation to the national projects than did those who came before them and those who have come after.

As might be expected, secondary methods instructors who apparently teach social studies methods courses full-time are higher in knowledge and use of project materials than are those who appear to have split responsibility. Also, as was shown in Part I, these secondary methods instructors were more modern in philosophy and more involved in their field. One wonders whether exposure to the national projects has been instrumental in modernizing the orientation of some secondary methods instructors. This relationship does not hold for elementary instructors primarily because the dichotomy between an education vs. an academic discipline background does not exist to the same degree at the elementary level, and because elementary instructors categorically are more modern in orientation than are secondary methods instructors.

One of the strongest relationships reported in this part of the study concerns the importance of belonging to social studies organizations such as The National Council for the Social Studies and the importance of attending national, regional, and state social studies meetings if methods instructors are to be high in knowledge and use of national project materials. Methods instructors who are not active professionally, seem to have little knowledge of new developments in the field.

Several variables concerning institutional setting are

related to high knowledge and use of project materials. Larger publicly-financed institutions with a full-time faculty devoted to social studies education have instructional staffs with high knowledge and utilization of national curriculum project materials. These findings support data reported and discussed in Part I of this study.

As was expected, a strong positive relationship was found between direct involvement in the national curriculum project movement and a high level of knowledge and use of project materials. Unfortunately, the data also revealed a very small number of social studies educators who were actually involved in the development or dissemination of project materials. One wonders what type of impact the national curriculum project movement might have had on social studies education if more educators had been involved in the project movement.

Instructors who were high in knowledge and use of project materials also reported considerable impact of the project movement on their own teaching, generally felt the project movement had had some positive effect on social studies teaching in secondary and elementary schools, and believed the project movement should have had even greater impact than it has had. They also supported continued and increased federal involvement in curriculum development and dissemination activities. Instructors unfamiliar with the projects were so strongly opposed to federal involvement in curriculum development and dissemination one wonders whether their responses reflected a "sour-grapes" attitude because educators were generally not included in the

project movement. This data might also be explained by starting at the other end of the relationship. Perhaps some educators were so strongly opposed to federal involvement in curriculum development that they purposely avoided the materials produced by the national projects. Although neither explanation sounds mature, productive, or desirable, both seem plausible. If either or both is accepted, then promoters of the curriculum projects have an even greater task ahead of them. Not only will they have to improve dissemination procedures -- especially for providing materials and instruction for professors -- they will also have to develop strategies to alter negative attitudes about the national curriculum project movement.

PART III

ORIENTATION TOWARD CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

In Part III of the study, we were interested in determining if undergraduate methods instructors had a national orientation toward curriculum development, or if their orientation would be local in nature. Based on a review of the literature dealing with national curriculum projects in social studies, specifically that literature dealing with advantages of the national project movement, and on the authors' own personal experiences in working with project materials, twelve statements were prepared concerning various aspects of curriculum development (see Table III-A). No effort was made to make the list inclusive of the many aspects of curriculum development. Instead, the list was to reflect a wide range of activities that might fall within the general category of curriculum development. Each statement was assessed on a five point scale: (1) always dealt with best on the national level, (2) generally dealt with best at the national level, (3) dealt with equally well at either the national or local level, (4) generally dealt with best at the local level, and (5) always dealt with best at the local level.

Table III-A reports the mean score for each statement by level of methods course taught and by total respondents. The statements are ranked for most national to most local based on the mean score for the total respondents. Examination of the mean scores for total respondents reveal that only two of

the twelve statements have a mean score of less that 2.5, which might be considered the national category, and that only two statements had mean scores above 3.5, which might be considered the local category. The other eight statements fall between a mean of 2.5 and 3.5. Six of these eight statements, however, have mean scores above 3.0, which would indicate a leaning toward a local orientation. In total, eight of the twelve statements have mean scores below 3.0. Generally speaking, then, methods instructors tended to express a local orientation toward curriculum development as assessed by the twelve statements in this study.

When the statements are examined individually, methods instructors placed "Focusing on educational goals important to the nation as a whole" and "Recruiting qualified scholars and teachers to work on developing instructional materials" clearly in the national category. "Developing teaching approaches based on actual classroom experiences" and "Encouraging in-service efforts focusing on new instructional technqiues" were placed clearly in the local category.

An examination of differences between elementary and secondary instructors reveals that on only three of the statements were there significant differences in mean scores ($p < .05$). For each of the statements "Recruiting qualified scholars and teachers to work on developing instructional materials," "Translating abstract ideas into practical teaching materials," and "Developing teaching approaches based on actual classroom experience," secondary methods instructors were significantly

more national than were instructors in elementary methods. On eight other statements, secondary instructors have mean scores indicating a more national orientation than their elementary colleagues, but differences in mean scores for the statements did not reach the required level of significance. From these data it would appear that secondary methods instructors are somewhat more national in orientation than are elementary methods instructors but that the overall orientation for both elementary and secondary instructors is decidedly mixed to local in orientation.

Analysis of data from this section of the questionnaire was facilitated by creation of an index based on an overall mean score for each respondent derived from individual responses to the twelve statements. Respondents with a mean score of less than 2.8 were placed in a national category, those with a mean score between 2.9 and 3.2 were placed in a mixed category, and those with a mean score over 3.3 were placed in a local category. The national category contained 86 respondents, the mixed category 91 respondents, and the local category 114 respondents.

Table III-B shows this national, mixed, and local categorization by state. In the Midwest, Wisconsin had the highest percentage in the national category, 41.7 percent, with Ohio having the highest percent in the local category, 60.8 percent. Responses from the individual western states were so few in number that the data have little meaning.

Analysis of the background variables of the respondents

in relation to the national, mixed, and local categories revealed twelve significant relationships ($p < .05$). These data are reported in Tables III-C through III-M.

Data in Table III-C confirmed what might have been expected from the data in Table III-A: elementary methods instructors, when viewed categorically, are significantly more local in orientation than are secondary methods instructors. Only 21.4 percent of the elementary instructors were in the national category as contrasted with 39.3 percent of the secondary methods instructors.

When we examine source of institutional financing, Table III-D, we find that instructors in publicly-financed institutions are significantly more national in orientation than their colleagues in private institutions. Just over 50 percent of those from private institutions are in the local category with only 30.7 percent of those from public institutions in this category.

Examination of curriculum orientation by highest degree held (Table III-E) also produced a significant relationship, but the data are difficult to interpret. Respondents holding a Ph.D. degree have the highest percentage in the national and local categories and would appear, on the surface, to be more polarized than those holding the Ed.D. degree or those with less than a doctorate. Only those holding the Ed.D. degree show the highest percentage of respondents in a category other than local, 44.4 percent in the mixed category.

Table III-F deals with orientation toward curriculum development by various levels of involvement with national curriculum projects and with materials developed by these projects. Only two of the variables, "Participant in course, workshop, or institute on national projects" and "Consultant to a national project" resulted in a significant positive relationship to being national in orientation. It is interesting to note that serving as a writer for a national project and being a staff member of a national project did not result in a significant relationship.

Table III-G considers orientation toward curriculum development by the degree to which the national project movement in social studies has influenced the nature of undergraduate methods instruction. The data reveal that those methods instructors reporting that the project movement has had great impact on their teaching are significantly more national in orientation than are those reporting less impact. Respondents reporting great impact on their teaching show 51.9 percent in the national category in contrast to only 13.8 percent for those respondents reporting no impact on their teaching.

Tables III-H, I, J, and K can be examined together for they all deal with federal involvement in curriculum development and in implementation and dissemination activities. A consistent finding in these tables is that respondents supporting federal involvement in these areas, and those encouraging increased federal financial support for development and implementation activities are significantly more national

in orientation than are those respondents who are unsure and those who disagree with federal involvement in these areas. It is interesting to note that, for the most part, those respondents in agreement with federal involvement in development and dissemination activities are evenly distributed across the national, mixed, and local categories. Those respondents that are unsure and those expressing disagreement are, however, far more likely to be in the local category.

Data reported in Tables III-L and III-M can also be viewed together. The tables deal with orientation toward curriculum development by perception of the impact of the national project movement on social studies instruction in secondary schools (Table III-L) and in elementary schools (Table III-M). In both cases, those who feel the impact of the project movement to be less than warranted are more national in orientation than are those who feel the impact to be about what is warranted and those who see the impact as more than warranted. As was the case with those in agreement with federal support for development and implementation activities, those who feel the impact of the national projects to be less than warranted are more evenly spaced across the national, mixed, and local categories than are those who feel the project impact to be about what is warranted and those who feel the impact to be more than warranted.

Tables III-N through III-DD present data for several additional variables found not to be significantly related to the national, mixed, or local orientations toward curriculum

development. No significant differences were found for age (Table III-N), recency of preparation (Table III-O), highest degree held (Table III-P), academic rank (Table III-Q), years teaching undergraduate methods (Table III-R), number of institutions taught in (Table III-S), type of methods course taught (Table III-T), number of professional organizations belonged to (Table III-U), membership in N.C.S.S. (Table III-V), attendance at regional and national N.C.S.S. meetings (Table III-W), attendance at state social studies meetings (Table III-X), region of the country (Table III-Y), on-campus enrollment (Table III-Z), number of methods sections taught (Table III-AA), number of students taught (Table III-BB), impact of the project movement on secondary school social studies (Table III-CC), and impact of project movement on elementary school social studies (Table III-DD).

Several of these tables, however, deserve comment. In Table III-N we see that those in the oldest age category (51 and over) are considerably more local than are those in the younger categories. Recency of preparation, however (Table III-O), shows no such pattern. Area of highest degree (Table III-P) came close to producing a significant relationship ($p = .09$) and shows that those whose highest degree is in an academic area are considerably more national than are those whose highest degree is in education.

It is somewhat surprising that membership in professional organizations (Table III-U), membership in N.C.S.S. (Table III-V), and attendance at national, regional, and state

social studies meetings (Tables III-W and III-X) did not result in significant relationships. One might have contended that those methods instructors belonging to numerous professional organizations, those who belong to the primary professional organization in their field, and those who are active in attending professional meetings would show a higher national orientation. Although the data lean in this direction, only membership in N.C.S.S. approached significance ($p = .07$).

Perception of the impact of the project movement on instruction in secondary and elementary schools (Tables III-CC and III-DD) is also interesting in that those respondents in the considerable positive category show a more national orientation toward curriculum development than do those in the other three categories.

Discussion

The findings from this part of the study are interesting from several perspectives. Although the respondents in the study were more local in orientation toward curriculum development than national in orientation, the direction was not strong. For most of the statements dealing with curriculum development, the respondents felt they could be handled equally well at either the national or local levels. From one perspective, this finding is somewhat surprising since the statements were selected primarily from among the advantages claimed for national curriculum development projects. However,

when one considers the local bias built into the American educational system (legal control at the local level and the firm belief that problem solving efforts should be local in nature and decisions responsive to the needs of the local community) and the nature of the socialization process of American educators, it is not surprising that university and college methods instructors would reflect this local view of curriculum development. That elementary methods instructors are even more local in orientation than are secondary methods instructors may confirm this proposition -- elementary schools are even more closely linked to the local community than are secondary schools.

It is also possible that methods professors are just not aware of what might be accomplished through federal involvement in curriculum development. Given the findings from Part II of the study that educators were not extensively involved in the national project movement, that they were relatively unaware of the materials produced by the national projects, and that they made little use of the project materials in their methods teaching, it may be that these instructors have not reflectively considered the possibilities which might be realized through a more national orientation toward curriculum development. Educators may indeed be acting out of an idealized image of American education and American society as it existed 20-30 years ago and attempting to preserve American education in a form which is no longer functional.

The finding that respondents in public institutions

are significantly more national in orientation than those in private institutions is consistent with the findings from Part I and Part II of the study. Not only are instructors in public institutions more national, they are also more modern in viewpoint concerning goals for the social studies and more likely to have high knowledge and use of project materials.

It is somewhat surprising that various types of involvement with the national curriculum projects did not result in more significant positive relationships with a national orientation toward curriculum development. One might have assumed a direct link between involvement with a project or with project materials and a national orientation. Such was not the case.

The significant positive relationship between high impact of the project movement on undergraduate methods teaching and holding a national orientation is also consistent with findings from previous parts of this study. Methods professors who report high project impact on their methods instruction are also more modern concerning goals for the social studies and are high in knowledge and use of project materials.

Another interesting and consistent finding from this part of the study is that support for federal involvement in curriculum development and in implementation and dissemination activities is linked to a national orientation toward curriculum development. It is not, however, that being high in support for federal involvement in these areas makes one national in orientation. Respondents high in federal support

were generally evenly distributed across the categories of national, mixed, and local. Not supporting federal involvement in these areas is, though, strongly linked to holding a local orientation toward curriculum development. Most of those who do not support federal efforts in curriculum development and dissemination are in the local category concerning orientation toward curriculum development. A similar pattern of relationships was discovered when the degree to which the impact of the project movement on instruction in elementary and secondary schools is warranted was examined.

PART IV

IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL CURRICULUM PROJECT MOVEMENT IN SOCIAL STUDIES AND BELIEFS CONCERNING FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

The fourth part of the study dealt with the perceptions of undergraduate social studies methods instructors concerning the impact of the national curriculum project movement in social studies and with beliefs concerning the role of the federal government in curriculum development and implementation activities.

One of the questions we were interested in was the extent to which the national project movement had influenced undergraduate methods instruction. In Table IV-A we see that 48.4 percent of the total respondents reported great to considerable impact on their teaching and 51.5 percent reported limited to no impact. Secondary methods professors felt that the national project movement had a significantly greater impact on their teaching than did elementary professors -- 61.4 percent of the elementary professors reported limited to no impact, while 54.8 percent of the secondary professors stated great to considerable impact.

Table IV-B deals with the perception of methods professors concerning the impact of the national curriculum projects on social studies teaching in elementary schools. The majority of the respondents in each of the three categories felt that the project movement had limited positive impact on social studies teaching at the elementary school level.

However, 26.6 percent of the total respondents stated considerable positive impact, with only 3.5 percent feeling that the impact had been negative. As with their own teaching, secondary methods professors were significantly more optimistic than elementary professors concerning the impact of the project movement on elementary social studies.

The extent to which the perceived impact of the national project movement on elementary social studies is warranted is dealt with in Table IV-C. The data are interesting in that the clear majority of the professors in each of the three categories felt that the impact has been less than is warranted. Very few respondents, 5.8 percent of the total, indicated the impact to be more than warranted.

Table IV-D considers the impact of the national project movement on social studies teaching in secondary schools. As with the impact on elementary schools, the majority in each category felt that the projects have had limited positive impact. It is important to note, however, that over 85 percent of the respondents in each category felt that the project impact has been positive.

The degree to which the impact on the teaching of social studies in secondary schools is warranted is considered in Table IV-E. Again, the clear majority of the respondents in each category felt the impact to be less than that warranted. Only 14 of the total 228 respondents to this item felt the impact to be more than is warranted.

Tables IV-F and IV-G deal with federal support for

curriculum development projects. The data in Table IV-F show that methods professors are in strong agreement with continued federal support for curriculum development. It is interesting to note that even though 61.8 percent of the elementary methods professors favor federal support for curriculum development efforts, secondary methods professors are significantly more likely ($p < .01$) to support this position. Elementary methods professors are more unsure of the wisdom of this action.

Table IV-G shows that secondary methods professors clearly favor increasing federal support for curriculum development efforts. Elementary professors are about equally divided between those who agree with increasing support and those who are unsure.

Tables IV-H and IV-I involve federal support for implementation and dissemination of curricular materials. Table IV-H shows that there is considerable support for federal involvement in these areas, even more so than was the support for federal involvement in curriculum development. There is also much less uncertainty as to the wisdom of federal involvement in these areas when compared with the uncertainty expressed with curriculum development.

Not only did the respondents believe in federal support for implementation and dissemination activities, they also felt that support for these activities should be increased (see Table IV-I). Secondary professors were significantly more likely to support this position than were elementary professors,

even though a majority of elementary professors did indicate support.

Supplementary Data

Several additional items of information from this section of the study aid in understanding the data presented here. First, responses to the above items were highly correlated with each other. Given this fact, it is interesting to take one of the items, e.g., impact of the national project movement on undergraduate teaching, and see what characteristics of the respondents were significantly related ($p < .05$) to this item on the questionnaire. When the analysis was conducted, the following items were positively related to impact on teaching:

1.	Participating in a special course or workshop on the national projects.	$p < .001$
2.	Conducting a course or workshop on the national projects.	$p < .001$
3.	Serving as a consultant to a national project.	$p < .001$
4.	Serving as a writer for a national project.	$p < .001$
5.	Serving as a staff member of a national project.	$p < .001$
6.	Being funded to conduct dissemination activities.	$p < .001$
7.	Publishing an article dealing with the national projects.	$p < .001$
8.	Being a member of The National Council for the Social Studies.	$p < .001$

9.	Being from a publicly financed institution as contrasted to a privately financed institution.	p <.001
10.	Attending three or more state or national social studies meetings within the last six years.	p <.001
11.	Teaching in an institution with over 3,000 enrollment.	p <.001
12.	Teaching methods for more than three years.	p <.01
13.	Being from the eight western states in contrast to being from the five eastern states.	p <.03
14.	Holding the doctorate degree.	p <.04
15.	Teaching social studies methods in contrast to a general methods course and a methods course in an academic discipline.	p <.04

As was reported earlier, it was found in the study that those respondents most influenced by the national projects and those most in favor of federal support for curriculum development and for implementation and dissemination activities were also most likely to actually use the national curriculum. projects in their undergraduate methods instruction.

Discussion

The data presented here provide some evidence that in the opinion of college methods instructors, the national curriculum project movement in social studies has influenced elementary and secondary school curriculums as well as their own teaching. Further, they feel the impact has been positive

in nature, although considerably less than warranted.

That secondary methods instructors have been more influenced by the national curriculum projects than elementary methods instructors and that they are stronger advocates of federal involvement in curriculum development, implementation, and dissemination activities may simply reflect the fact that the majority of the federal support for efforts in these areas has been directed at the secondary level. Given this fact, one might contend that secondary methods instructors are more likely to benefit directly from federal support for curriculum development and dissemination activities through being funded to engage in such activities. Data from the study reveal, however, that only a small percentage of the methods instructors have actually been funded to conduct special projects in these areas. Nevertheless, a desire for funding may partially explain the methods instructors' support for increased federal funding for curriculum development, implementation, and dissemination activities -- a project may come my way if only the funding level were increased.

That methods instructors feel strongly that the national projects have not had the impact on elementary and secondary schools that is warranted, and that the projects have influenced their own teaching, suggests that there may be more than just personal gain motivating their support for federal efforts. Methods instructors genuinely seem to feel that the projects deserve a better fate than they have received to date, and that federal funding for curriculum development and

for implementation and dissemination activities should not only be continued but should be increased. Obviously, methods instructors in social studies education see far more good than bad in the projects which have been created, and believe in the value of continued federal support. These beliefs may also be a reflection of how methods instructors conceive of the change process in American schools. Support for federal efforts may reflect a belief that change can take place from the outside in, with the federal government serving as the catalyst. Methods instructors may also believe that improved curricular materials, in and of themselves, can change the nature of social studies instruction if only teachers are informed of their existence and trained in their use.

The strength of the support for increased federal emphasis on implementation and dissemination activities is somewhat surprising given the fact that this aspect of previous federal involvement has come under considerable criticism. It has been argued that federal support for implementation and dissemination of curricular products developed with federal funds provides unfair advantages for these materials in competition with materials developed through private sources. Even if true, and these authors do not support such a position, methods instructors apparently feel that the project materials need and deserve this special advantage.

The most striking aspect of the supplementary data is that those instructors who have had some form of involvement

with a national curriculum project or with materials produced by a project are more likely to feel that their teaching has been influenced by the national project movement. These instructors are, in most cases, the same ones most in favor of federal support for curriculum development projects and for implementation and dissemination activities. This is not to say, of course, that other instructors are not supportive of such efforts, for we have seen there is strong support for this position.

PART V

COMPARING INDICES

In this section of the paper we present data on the relationships between the various indices created for the study. As reported earlier, data from the questionnaire were organized into four indices:

1. Modern, less modern, and least modern beliefs concerning goals for the social studies.
2. High, medium, and low knowledge and utilization of elementary project materials.
3. High, medium, and low knowledge and utilization of secondary project materials.
4. National, mixed, and local orientations concerning curriculum development.

Table V-A deals with beliefs of secondary methods instructors concerning goals for the social studies as related to their knowledge and use of secondary project materials. The data revealed a significant positive relationship between high knowledge and use of project materials and a modern orientation towards social studies. Among secondary instructors high in project knowledge and use, 42.1 percent were in the most modern category. In contrast, 55.0 percent of the instructors low in knowledge and use were in the least modern category.

The data in Table V-B are interesting in that a similar comparison for elementary instructors did not produce this kind of relationship. Elementary instructors high in knowledge

and use of elementary project materials are no more likely to be modern in orientation toward the social studies than are those low in knowledge and use. In fact, the data lean the other way with 53.3 percent of the low group being modern in orientation, and only 42.9 percent of the high group being in the modern category. These differences are not significant, however.

Table V-C deals with the relationship between orientation of secondary methods instructors toward curriculum development and their knowledge and use of secondary project materials. The data revealed a significant positive relationship between high knowledge and use of project materials and a national orientation toward curriculum development. Of those in the high knowledge and use category, 52.8 percent are also national in orientation, with only 13.9 percent in the local category. By contrast, only 18.9 percent of those low in knowledge and use are national in orientation, with 43.2 percent in the local category.

Table V-D presents a comparison similar to that in Table V-C, but this time for elementary instructors. As can be seen, knowledge and use of elementary project materials among elementary instructors is not significantly related to their orientation toward curriculum development. In contrast to their secondary colleagues, elementary methods instructors are consistently more local in orientation regardless of their utilization of the national curriculum projects.

Table V-E relates belief in a modern, less modern, and least modern social studies program with orientation toward curriculum development. Comparisons are presented for secondary instructors, elementary instructors, and for total respondents. Although there is a slight tendency for national orientation to be associated with modern goals for the social studies, and for local orientation to be associated with least modern goals for social studies, the differences are not statistically significant.

Discussion

The most striking aspect of the data presented in this section is, again, the differences between elementary and secondary methods instructors. For secondary methods instructors there is a significant positive relationship between being high in knowledge and use of secondary national project materials and in being modern concerning goals for the social studies. There is also a significant, positive relationship between being high in knowledge and use of secondary project materials and being national concerning orientation toward curriculum development. For elementary methods instructors, these relationships do not exist. Those elementary instructors high in knowledge and use of elementary project materials are no more likely to be modern concerning goals for the social studies than are those low in knowledge and use. Those instructors high in knowledge and use are no

more likely to be national in orientation toward curriculum development than are those low in knowledge and use.

The significant positive relationships for secondary methods instructors between knowledge and use of project materials and modern and national orientation might have been expected. Many of the goals statements classified as modern for this study were reflective of changes in the social studies during the last fifteen years. This time period, of course, encompasses the national curriculum project movement of the 60's and early 70's. Although not all of the modern goal statements are found within the expressed goals of the national project movement, many of the goal statements are consistent with the nature of the social studies as expressed through the project materials. Those instructors, then, who are high in knowledge and use of the project materials might be expected to share the more modern orientation toward the social studies. These same secondary instructors might also be expected to be more national in orientation toward curriculum development. Since secondary instructors obviously favor the national project movement and the goals for the social studies as expressed through these materials, it is not surprising that they believe important curricular decisions can be made at the national level.

That the data for elementary methods instructors did not produce similar positive relationships is, at first glance, surprising. One might expect that elementary methods instructors would be subject to the same forces as secondary

instructors and that the relationships would be similar. As the data revealed, however, elementary instructors are uniformally more modern toward goals for the social studies, with 44 percent of the respondents in the modern category as contrasted with only 25 percent of the secondary respondents. This modern orientation of elementary instructors has been a reoccurring theme throughout the study and may, more than anything else, be a reflection of the long standing nature of elementary education. The nature of elementary education may traditionally be more in keeping with what has been advocated in recent years as a modern view of the social studies. Elementary instructors, it seems, generally hold this modern viewpoint regardless of their commitment or lack of commitment to the national curriculum project materials. Perhaps secondary methods instructors are now just catching up with their elementary colleagues concerning a general philosophy of education, a philosophy somewhat consistent with modern goals for the social studies. But this movement is obviously more pronounced for those instructors high in knowledge and use of the project materials.

That the local orientation of elementary instructors is not related to their knowledge and use of the national projects may also be a reflection of the general nature of elementary education. Given the fact that elementary school education in the United States has always had a local bias (the administrative units should be small enough to allow direct community and parental input into decision making), it

is not surprising that elementary methods instructors would reflect this bias regardless of their commitment or lack of commitment to curricular materials produced on the national level.

Given previous data, one might have expected that secondary methods instructors who are modern in goals for the social studies would show a positive relationship with a national orientation toward curriculum development. Data in Table V-E reveal that this was not the case. Obviously, orientation toward the proper locale for curriculum development and degree of support for a modern social studies program are unrelated.

PART VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although it was not necessarily the intent of this study to produce a set of recommendations, several findings from the study suggest actions which might be beneficial to the social studies profession.

First, according to the undergraduate methods professors surveyed in this study, more federal effort should be devoted to the development of new curricular materials in social studies and to the dissemination and implementation of these materials. Not only did the methods instructors feel that the curricular materials previously developed with federal funding to be of high quality, they felt that the current levels of federal support for curriculum development and implementation should be increased. If, however, the federal government is to again become actively involved in curriculum development efforts for elementary and secondary social studies, university educators must be actively involved in the development process. If not, methods professors as a group are unlikely to develop the interest and commitment necessary for the inclusion of the new materials in their training programs. It is hard to develop commitment to the dissemination of information about materials which one feels have been developed outside the profession.

Second, ways must be found by which methods instructors can be systematically introduced to new materials in the field.

Current efforts are sporadic to nonexistent and obviously miss the majority of methods instructors. Methods professors could be an important link in the process of information dissemination if they are informed about new materials.

Third, methods instructors must make an effort to introduce students to new developments in the field. To do this, they must have new materials available to them if they are going to make instruction in the materials an integral part of their preparation programs. Budgets must be available for the purchase of the new materials, or publishers must be willing to make the materials available to universities. It would also be helpful if publisher representatives from the elementary and secondary divisions would call on college instructors to see if they have the publisher's most recent instructional materials. As it is now, college representatives who call on university professors have no knowledge of new materials being presented by their elementary and secondary divisions.

Fourth, a concerted effort must be made to recruit methods professors to membership in The National Council for the Social Studies and to encourage their attendance at national, state, and local social studies meetings. Membership in The National Council for the Social Studies and active participation within the profession has a strong positive relationship with being modern in orientation toward the social studies and with high knowledge and utilization of new instructional materials.

Fifth, research needs to be conducted which might result in a systematic diffusion model for the spread of information on new curricular materials in social studies. Activities of undergraduate methods instructors would be an integral aspect of that model.

NOTES

[1]For a review of efforts to define the social studies see: Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. Defining The Social Studies. Bulletin 51, National Council for the Social Studies, Arlington, Virginia, 1977.

[2]For studies on the utilization of project materials in social studies see: Carol L. Hahn, Gerald W. Marker, Thomas J. Switzer, and Mary Jane Turner. Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials. Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado, 1977; John Guenther and Wayne Dumas. "Teacher Familiarity With and Use of Project Social Studies Materials in the Midwest." Educational Leadership 30 (7): 641-43; April 1973.